



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ward Cummings, of Boston, and Dr. William C. Gannett, of Rochester. Both addresses deeply interested and stirred the audience. Resolutions were presented by Judge Prescott Keyes, of Concord, Mass., from the business committee, and unanimously adopted, pledging the churches of the association to aid in the creation of international peace sentiment, and especially in securing the ratification of the arbitration treaties negotiated by President Taft, and now before the Senate.

. . . At its recent annual convention in Lynn, the Massachusetts State Prohibition Convention adopted the following resolution, which was presented by Hon. J. B. Lewis: "We believe that all international disputes which cannot be settled by diplomacy should be decided by a High Court of Nations."

. . . While at St. Paul, on August 7, on a tour of the United States, Mr. Quan Kai, special commissioner of the Vice-Roy of Canton, declared that the arbitration treaties between this country and Great Britain and France would be of great benefit to China. He said: "The arbitration treaties between the United States and England, and the United States and France, recently signed, are the most far-reaching steps toward the realization of universal peace ever undertaken in the history of the nations of the world. China will be benefited greatly by the treaties, and the time will come when similar pacts will be entered into between American and Oriental nations."

The Events of the Year in Regard to War and Peace.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BERNE PEACE BUREAU.

By Dr. A. Gobat, Secretary.

The amazing incoherence of which Europe has given the spectacle for half a century continues to disturb, and even to exasperate, humanity. The government authorities, with the carelessness and blindness of those whom Jupiter smites with madness when he wishes to destroy them, offer an invincible resistance to the demands for union, coöperation, and harmony of the nations. It is an anomaly which justifies people of good sense in charging with madness the dominant political psychology; it is indeed a public scandal, as some have called it. The feeling that there are no longer two types of morality—that right and justice should not be violated in international relations—has never perhaps expressed itself with such force. Three of the great powers have laid aside the old principle of national honor and vital interests which were protected under the sacred ægis of homicidal war, and have rendered impossible between them the exercise of arbitrariness and violence by the conclusion of permanent general treaties of obligatory arbitration. Nevertheless, anxiety for the morrow has never been more intense throughout the civilized world than now. Is this because questions particularly profound and troublesome have arisen? No; war today may break out over petty interests of speculation. It is one of the disgraces of our time that in order to help certain rapacious ones in their exploitation of the peoples of outside countries disturbing conflicts are brought on and even declarations of war made.

Europe has remained, therefore, during the year whose character we are tracing, under the menace of the armies, the cannon, the battleships of the powers which persist in provoking one another or in giving each other mutual fear by the display of military forces, the expenses and burdens of which are borne by the people, not only without profit to them, but also to the detriment of all Europe. The powers have, nevertheless, had presented to them an opportunity to take into consideration the question of the reduction of armaments. This was at the time of the organization of Alsace-Lorraine. The refusal to put this country on the same basis as the other states of the German Confederation, and thereby to give a favorable answer to the petition addressed to the Emperor in 1905 by the German Peace Society, which asked of him "to give the necessary instructions for rendering the inhabitants of Alsace-Lorraine equal in rights with the other states of the German Empire," has deprived the world of the most fruitful of the elements of pacification. It has probably also increased the antagonisms of which Europe is suffering the deplorable consequences. The Alsace-Lorraine National Union will continue its struggle for autonomy.

If the Eastern question, as it was formerly conceived, no longer exists, or remains at least latent, the Ottoman empire does not cease to furnish plenty of questions—that is, incidents—which disturb internal peace and provoke, without, more or less opportune interventions. There have been new massacres of Armenians, and in Albania popular uprisings, which have brought about intervention by armed force, and which might have provoked a conflict with Montenegro. This would have been very regrettable, for King Nicholas deserves rather recognition for the care given in his kingdom to the wounded and the sick, as also for his good offices with a view to pacification. The imperial government has been moderate in its repression of the revolutionary movement, and has decided to make, along the extreme western frontier of the Ottoman Empire, concessions which it was in the general interest to grant. It was obliged to consider that Albania is a rampart whose strength depends on the fidelity of its inhabitants and the peace of the country. Furthermore, if account is taken of the numerous difficulties confronting the new *régime*, which replaced the autocracy of the Sultan, it must be recognized that the constitutional government is endeavoring to justify the revolution of 1908 by laboring sincerely for the regeneration of the government and the pacification of the people.

With the same purpose, Portugal, in its turn, underwent a revolution in October, 1910. Bad administration, corruption and abuse, the necessity of ameliorating the social and economic conditions of the country and relieving the nation of the ignorance in which it was systematically held, were the causes of this revolution. The republic displaced the monarchy. At Lisbon, as at Constantinople, the new *régime*, established almost without the shedding of blood, obtained the approval of the great majority of the nations. The moderation with which it has organized the republic permits us to hope that this form of state will triumph over the attacks of which it may be the object. From the point of view of peace in general the Portuguese revolution is an important event, not only because the republic of itself assures the carrying on of the government under the ægis of

justice and social and civic equality, but still more because it puts an end to interior dissensions and conflicts which might have occasioned exterior complications.

There is not, therefore, nor will there be any Portuguese question. But the Egyptian question continues, and the Commission of the Bureau, requested by the Egyptian Peace Society to put this question on the program of the 19th Universal Peace Congress, has decided to comply with this request to the extent of raising the question in the report concerning the events of the year. Discussion will doubtless follow. It is our duty to throw light upon this by citing a page of history:

After the opening of the Suez Canal, in 1869, Egypt became the object of particular attention, for on her fell the duty of protecting and defending the great international waterway; and the country, in order to fulfill its mission, was under the necessity of having a government capable of providing therefor. The Khedive, Ismail Pacha, seemed no longer capable of furnishing sufficient guaranties, as Egypt, under different unfortunate enterprises and bad administration, was undergoing a very grave financial crisis, her debts having reached a critical figure. England and France, in the interest of their creditors, imposed upon the Khedive a system of financial control. He even accepted an Englishman and a Frenchman as part of his council of ministers; but in 1879 Ismail wished to throw off the foreign intervention, which the Egyptians did not like. His project failed, and the Sultan, on the demand of the great powers, dismissed him. Under Tewfik, his son and successor, who was incapable, by reason of his indolence, of preventing the exactions made by the numerous foreigners who had come to Egypt as the result of the European intervention, the national party was formed. Its leader, Colonel Arabi, secured his nomination as minister of war, and the government was reorganized on the basis of the national will in 1881. The protestation and threats of England and France resulted in aggravating the national opposition. Arabi became dictator, and the population assumed an attitude hostile to foreigners to such an extent that the most of them left the country. The powers having been unable to come to an agreement to restore order, England undertook to overthrow Arabi by force of arms. She succeeded in 1882. Since that time she has occupied, by military force, the valley of the Nile and exercised a certain domination over the government of the Khedive. It was because of these two circumstances that a new national party was formed in Egypt. This party is demanding the cessation of the occupation and the emancipation of the government from the tutelage of England.

It is proper to complete the preceding indications by the citation of two declarations made by the British government. On the occasion of the treaty of Constantinople, October 29, 1888, concerning the navigation of the Suez Canal, delegates of Great Britain made the following reservation: "The delegates of Great Britain, in presenting the text of this treaty, as a definite *régime* destined to guarantee the free use of the Suez Canal, believe it to be their duty to formulate a general reservation as to the application of these arrangements, so far as they may not be compatible with the transitory and exceptional condition in which Egypt actually finds itself, and so far as they might restrict the liberty of action of their government during the occupation of

Egypt by the forces of His Britannic Majesty." On the other hand, the Anglo-French arrangement, signed at London the 8th of April, 1904, contains, in regard to Egypt, the following article: "The government of His Britannic Majesty declares that it has no intention of changing the political state of Egypt. On its part, the government of the French Republic declares that it will not interfere with the action of England in this country by asking that a limit be fixed to the British occupation." Such, in brief, is the history of the occupation of Egypt by the troops of England and of its political intervention in this country.

The Egyptian Peace Society sees in the occupation of the Nile Valley a general danger, because this country "is an arena where, in the political, economic, and social domains the most diverse interests are in conflict and no field is more fertile in conflicts of all sorts and in menaces to the general peace." Besides, the national party holds that Egypt is sufficiently wise, prudent and enlightened to govern itself.

This is evidently the principal point, the question which it is important to solve before all else, because of the important interests which center about the Suez Canal and the protection of this interoceanic passage.

Egypt is not the darkest point on the horizon of peace. Morocco is giving the peoples much more anxiety. There is certainly no sane reason why, in a corner of Africa which is semi-barbarous, peace and war, the lot of several great powers and the tranquillity of Europe should be at stake. It is, nevertheless, on account of Morocco that the work of pacification is hindered. This work was well under way when the Emperor of Germany thought it to be his duty to make a personal demonstration at Tangiers, which revived certain feelings of bitterness and held back a possible *rapprochement*. Nevertheless, the conference of Algenciras seemed to have reassured men's minds, and although its deliberations did not furnish a solution, Europe, which lives from day to day, and contents herself with so little, found herself, through the action of the great powers, gratified with a brief respite. It was not of long duration. The sending of a German ship of war into Moroccan waters, accompanied by a demonstration of international antagonism which was exaggerated by the yellow press, cast the world anew into anxiety. Oh, the ship which stops or cruises before Agadir will not occasion war! Was it not a German general who said the other day, "The generations capable of enduring a war in the present conditions have not yet been created"? But the Moroccan incident awakened wrath and created a bad fever of chauvinism. *Rapprochements*, which appeared possible, must suffer an arrest and the folly of armaments has received new encouragement. This is why the incidents connected with Morocco are in the highest degree regrettable. Owing to the anarchy which reigns in Europe and the small confidence which the peoples have in their governments, these incidents have assumed the proportions of a sharp crisis. This, indeed, became menacing by the fact that in certain circles the false chord of national honor was set to vibrating. In brief, the blusterings had their customary effect; panic on the exchange, panic among the capitalists, panic in industry and commerce, numerous failures in several countries. By its provocative character armed peace has made all Europe tremble.

There exists a certain analogy between the Moroccan

and Egyptian questions. Both are European questions—indeed, world questions—the product of the common interests of several powers. In consequence the difficulties to which they may give rise must be removed by means of agreement. Any other process would be arbitrary. The Act of Algeciras of April 7, 1906, had as its aim the rectification of the political and financial condition of the Moroccan Empire. To France was entrusted the duty of reëstablishing order there. She evidently could not fulfill her duty without making use of armed force, and she was, it seems, sole judge of the military operations which had to be undertaken, or which the Moroccan anarchy forced her to execute. It does not appear to be admissible that one or another of the interested powers was authorized to follow anxiously these operations and to make on its own account a military intervention with which it had not been charged. The situation would be different if the intervention of France should take on the character of aggression upon the country. But the circumstances did not allow of the interpretation of her military operations in this way. Even if this eventuality appeared probable, it was the duty of the powers who signed the act of Algeciras to examine the complaint which any one of them might make and cause the convention to be respected. However it may be, a war cannot break out over Morocco. For in whose interests would the armies be conducted to the carnage? The speculators!

The Agadir incident, like so many other vexing questions, shows how justifiable are the efforts put forth for the establishment to the widest possible extent of the method of arbitration. The whole world may felicitate itself on the progress realized in this matter within the year. A generous initiative, undertaken by the United States, has rapidly gone forward. In December last President Taft proclaimed at a banquet that even questions of national honor and disputes concerning the vital interests of nations may be submitted to arbitration; and on the 3d of August last the United States, France, and Great Britain signed general treaties of arbitration on this basis. That is a victory for the peace movement—a step of progress both political and social so much the more gratifying as the discussions over the question raised by Mr. Taft have given rise in different parliaments, notably in the House of Commons, to thorough examination of the critical situation in which human society finds itself at the present time. The limitation of armaments, it has been said, is for civilization a question of life and death, and the best means to realize this necessary end will be to establish, through unlimited treaties of arbitration, international justice and legality on bases so solid that the practice of arbitrariness and violence between the nations will become impossible. By the Anglo-American and the Franco-American treaties there has been constituted a union of the states which repudiate war. This will realize the idea so natural, so perfectly human, that the future of the world is to be an association of nations in place of an aggressive rivalry of nations.

The great Carnegie Peace Foundation, whose establishment coincides with the declarations of President Taft, will contribute to the realization of this ideal. It is necessary to bring to light all the elements which belong to the domain of war and show the profound causes and multiplied effects of each bloody slaughter,

to consider it not only from the point of view of the belligerent states, but also from the point of view of the others and of all civilization, and then to throw upon this bloody mass the light of morality, justice, and humanity. This will give us the true annals of each nation, the lesson of things which will reduce to silence international blusterings and chauvinism, the awakening of a human conscience which will dominate the egoisms which do not recoil even from crime. The Carnegie Foundation has already begun its activities. Its administrators have established a section on international law, one on political economy and history, and one on international relations and education. The second of these has just held its first conference in the city which is the seat of the Permanent International Peace Bureau. Its extended and practical program is a guarantee that the work of the American pacifist will play a decisive rôle in the development of the new culture whose aim should be to destroy the traditional policy which has come down as the deadly legacy of the past centuries. The Carnegie Foundation for International Peace will justify its name.

The pacifists of the whole world will show their unbounded gratitude to the United States, from which have come the most effective initiatives for the substitution of justice in the place of violence.

BERNE, *September*, 1911.

The Berne Meeting of the International Peace Bureau.

From Our Special Correspondent.

The history of the Rome Peace Congress of 1911, which did not occur, was much like that of the Stockholm Peace Congress of 1909, which did not occur. For a month before the date fixed for the Congress the conditions in Italy, owing to the cholera, had raised doubt as to the meeting in Rome; but it was not until a fortnight before the date that the Congress was definitely given up. This abandonment was presently followed by a notice of a meeting of the General Assembly of the International Peace Bureau at Berne, September 26 and 27, preceded by a meeting of the Standing Committee or Commission of the Bureau, September 25. About one hundred of the leading peace workers from different countries gathered at Berne for the meeting.

Among those present were the following members of the Commission: Mme. la Baronne de Suttner, M. Henri La Fontaine, M. Emile Arnaud, M. le Dr. A. Gobat, M. le Dr. Jules Ducommun, M. J. Alexander, M. le Baron Carl Carlsson Bonde, M. le Dr. George Bovet, M. le Dr. William Evans Darby, M. A.-H. Fried, M. Fredrik Green, M. le Directeur Fr. Kémeny, M. Gaston Moch, M. Felix Moscheles, M. Edwin D. Mead, M. Bucher-Heller, M. le Dr. Nilsson, M. le Professeur Quidde, M. le Dr. Adolphe Richter, M. Th. Ruyssen, Mme. Ziper-nowsky.

Others present were: Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Ginn, Mrs. Mead, Mrs. Andrews, Mr. and Mrs. S. E. Nicholson, U. J. Ledoux, from the United States; from England, Norman Angell, Carl Heath, F. W. Fox; from France, Jacques Dumas, M. Prudhaummeaux; from Germany, Dr. Arthur West Phaal, the new secretary of the German